

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 are pending. By this response, claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kahn, et al (US 2004/0004664). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kahn teaches a system in which image data acquired is transmitted to a PDA, phone or computer. Kahn uses GPS data to determine the location of each image. Kahn system performs determination of the user location and association of the information with the image of the camera itself. In Kahn's system, images can be displayed on a screen together. However, Kahn does not teach displaying map data indicating a travel route together with thumbnail images which are in chronological order on a display screen.

Therefore, Kahn fails to teach, *inter alia*, displaying together, on a display screen, both map data indicating a travel route and thumbnail images in chronological order, as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16. Therefore, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is not proper. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20 and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Loui, et al. (US 6,636,648) in view of Wilcock, et al (US 6,741,864) and claims 2, 7, 9, 12, 14, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over Loui, Wilcock and Kino, et al. (US 6,832,101). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Loui discloses an algorithm for creating an album by classifying images based on a distance between the predetermined reference position and the photographing location of the captured image. In Loui's system, all image data is forwarded while provided to a single computer. Images are processed at the computer itself. Loui teaches displaying images on the computer display. However, Loui does not teach or suggest displaying together, on a display screen, both map data indicating a travel route and thumbnail images in a chronological order, as recited in claims 1, 6, 11 and 16.

Further, Wilcock teaches a system in which photos taken by a camera are stamped with a location data. The location data and photos are downloaded onto a computer. The computer performs an organization of the images based on the time stamp and location data associated with the images. As illustrated at Fig. 6 at Wilcock, both map data and images are displayed together on a screen. However, the map data is stagnant and does not illustrate a travel route. Moreover, the images are not arranged in chronological order.

Therefore, Wilcock fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, displaying together, on a display screen, both map data indicating travel route and thumbnail images in a chronological order, as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16. Therefore, the combination of Loui and Wilcock fail to teach each and every feature of independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 as required.

Further, Kino fails to remedy the deficiencies of Loui and Wilcock. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are also in condition for allowance for above reasons as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that the combination of references fail to establish a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

For at least the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-25 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$450.00 is attached hereto.


Application No. 10/669,593  
Amendment dated June 11, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2007

Docket No.: 2091-0291P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  48,917  
for Michael R. Cammarata  
Registration No.: 39,491  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant